	Case 2:08-cv-00498-JCM-RJJ D	ocument 5	Filed 06/10/08	Page 1 of 5
1				
2				
3				
4				
5	HAITED	CTATEC D	CTDICT COUD	т
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
8	DODEDT ALEYANDED SZILAGYL	( <b>D</b> )		
10	ROBERT ALEXANDER SZILAGYI, J Plaintiff,		2:08-cv-0498-JCN	∕I_R II
11	VS.		2.00-CV-0470-JCI	VI-ICJJ
12	CLARK COUNTY DETENTION		ORDER	
13	CENTER, et al.,			
14	Defendants.	) /		
15				
16	I. Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Docket #4)  Before the Court is plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis. Based on the information regarding plaintiff's financial status, including any additional information plaintiff may have provided, the Court finds that plaintiff is not able to pay an initial installment payment towards the full filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Plaintiff will, however, be required to make monthly payments towards the full \$350.00 filing fee when he has funds available.  II. Complaint States Cognizable Claims			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	A. Plaintiff's Status as a Pretrial Detainee			
26	Plaintiff alleges that he has been subjected to unsafe living conditions and deliberate			
	indifference to serious medical needs w	hile incarcera	ated at the Clark C	County Detention Center.
	l .			

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff alleges that he is a pretrial detainee, having not been convicted of a crime. Throughout the complaint, plaintiff alleges that the Clark County Detention Center violated his Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. A pretrial detainee's right to be free from punishment is grounded in the Due Process Clause, but courts borrow from Eighth Amendment jurisprudence when analyzing the rights of pretrial detainees. See Gibson v. County of Washoe, 290 F.3d 1175, 1187 (9th Cir. 2002); Frost v. Agnos, 152 F.3d 1124, 1129 (9th Cir. 1998); Carnell v. Grimm, 74 F.3d 977, 979 (9th Cir. 1996); Anderson v. County of Kern, 45 F.3d 1310, 1312-13 (9th Cir. 1995).

### **B.** Unsafe Living Conditions

Plaintiff alleges that during his confinement as a pretrial detainee, he has been subjected to unfavorable living conditions at the Clark County Detention Center. Specifically, plaintiff alleges that he is forced to sleep on a temporary cot in a common area that is crowded and unsanitary. Plaintiff alleges that at times, his cot was placed where it directly blocked access to the emergency exit door. Plaintiff further alleges that he is not provided with a sanitary eating area. Although prison conditions may be restrictive and harsh, prison officials must provide prisoners with food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety. *Id.*; Toussaint v. McCarthy, 801 F.2d 1080, 1107 (9th Cir. 1986); Hoptowit v. Ray, 682 F.2d 1237, 1246 (9th Cir. 1982). Where a prisoner alleges injuries stemming from unsafe conditions of confinement, prison officials may be held liable only if they acted with "deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of serious harm." Frost v. Agnos, 152 F.3d 1124, (9th Cir. 1998) (citing Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835 (1994). Plaintiff has alleged sufficient facts to state a cognizable claim for unconstitutional conditions of confinement.

## C. Deliberate Indifference to Medical Needs

Plaintiff alleges that he has been diagnosed as a non-insulin dependent diabetic, and that he must control his blood sugar through his diet. Plaintiff alleges that he was originally placed on a diabetic diet and evening snack, but that as of April 3, 2008, the diabetic diet was discontinued. Plaintiff is now given a diet laden with sugar, which is inappropriate for his medical condition. Plaintiff complained to jail staff, but was told that he is not diabetic. Plaintiff asserts that no blood work was done to properly diagnose his diabetic condition. Plaintiff has alleged adequate facts to state a claim for deliberate indifference to medical needs. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976); *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994).

#### **D.** Access to Courts

Plaintiff alleges that he has been denied the opportunity to attend the law library to conduct legal research during his pretrial confinement. "[T]he Fourteenth Amendment protects all pretrial detainees against governmental interference in their right of access to courts." *Hydrick v. Hunter*, 500 F.3d 978, 999-1000 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) (citations omitted). The right of access to the courts includes not only the right to consult with defense counsel, but also to use available law library resources. *Id.* at 1000. Plaintiff states a cognizable claim for denial of access to the courts.

#### IV. Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma* pauperis (Docket #4) without having to prepay the full filing fee is **GRANTED**; plaintiff shall not be required to pay an initial installment fee. Nevertheless, the full filing fee shall still be due, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, as amended by the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act of 1996. The movant herein is permitted to maintain this action to conclusion without the necessity of prepayment of fees or costs or the giving of security therefor. This order granting *in forma pauperis* status shall not extend to the issuance of subpoenas at government expense.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2), the Clark County Detention Center shall pay to the Clerk of the United States District Court, District of Nevada, 20% of the preceding month's deposits to the account of Robert Alexander Szilagyi, Inmate # 2677761 (in months that the account exceeds \$10.00) until the full \$350.00 filing fee has been paid for this action. If plaintiff should be transferred and become under the care of the Nevada Department of Corrections, the CCDC Accounting Supervisor is directed to send a copy of this order

to the attention of the Chief of Inmate Services for the Nevada Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 7011, Carson City, NV 89702, indicating the amount that plaintiff has paid toward his filing fee, so that funds may continue to be deducted from plaintiff's account. The Clerk shall send a copy of this order to the CCDC Accounting Supervisor, 330 S. Casino Center Blvd., Las Vegas, NV 89101. (in months that the account exceeds \$10.00) until the full \$350 filing fee has been paid for this action. The Clerk also shall send a copy of this order to the attention of Albert G. Peralta, Chief of Inmate Services for the Nevada Department of Prisons, P.O. Box 7011, Carson City, NV 89702.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, even if this action is dismissed, or is otherwise unsuccessful, the full filing fee shall still be due, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915, as amended by the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act of 1996.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court SHALL FILE the complaint and that the complaint shall be served.

summons to the named defendants herein, and deliver same to the U.S. Marshal for service. Plaintiff shall have twenty (20) days in which to furnish to the U.S. Marshal the required Forms USM-285. Within twenty (20) days after receiving from the U.S. Marshal a copy of the Form USM-285 showing whether service has been accomplished, plaintiff must file a notice with the Court identifying which defendants were served and which were not served, if any. If plaintiff wishes to have service again attempted on an unserved defendant(s), then a motion must be filed with the Court identifying the unserved defendant(s) and specifying a more detailed name and/or address for said defendant(s), or whether some other manner of service should be attempted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that henceforth, plaintiff shall serve upon defendants or, if appearance has been entered by counsel, upon the attorney(s), a copy of every pleading, motion or other document submitted for consideration by the court. Plaintiff shall include with the original paper submitted for filing a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of the document was mailed to the defendants or counsel for the defendants. The court may disregard any paper

# received by a district judge or magistrate judge which has not been filed with the Clerk, and any paper received by a district judge, magistrate judge or the Clerk which fails to include a certificate of service. DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2008.

Case 2:08-cv-00498-JCM-RJJ Document 5 Filed 06/10/08 Page 5 of 5